

IMPACT OF PHILOSOPHERS ON FRENCH REVOLUTION

INTRODUCTION

"It is too soon to tell" was the reply that Zhou En-Lai gave to a question about the impact of the French Revolution on human civilization. It has been related by Simon Schama, a world-renowned historian, in the beginning of his magisterial work on the French Revolution, *Citizens*.¹ Zhou En-Lai's reply becomes more comprehensible in the light of statement made by the French historian Georges Lefebvre in 1939 that the "ideas of the French Revolution toured the globe." He meant that ideas and example of the actions of the revolutionaries changed the political outlook and inspired new secular hope among the peoples of the world.

The word *revolution* carries a connotation of far-reaching change in the polity through radical transformation of society. It is mostly an epoch-making upheaval in human affairs. The revolution is an outcome of a contest between the old order which is dying and the new order which is rising. Trotsky defines a revolution as the moment when the masses, that is to say, the millions of ordinary men and women, begin to participate in politics, to take their lives and destinies into their own hands. Revolution stirs up society to the bottom, and mobilizes layers that were previously inert and "non-political". The role of women in the French revolution is a graphic illustration of this fact. Among the most decisive moments in the revolution was the fifth of October 1789, when six or seven thousand women of Paris marched in the pouring rain to Versailles to demand bread and to force the king to move to Paris. The men were shamed into joining this strange procession of "the baker, the baker's wife and the baker's boy" which turned the king of France into a virtual prisoner of the revolutionary people. Thomas Carlyle, trying to paint a fiery-bright picture of the Revolution, described Paris in the second week of July 1789 as already a city in which "the streets are a living foam-sea.... Mad Paris is abandoned altogether to itself." From his mid-nineteenth-century perspective, Carlyle viewed the crowd as an uncontrolled mob, blood-thirsty and wild-eyed. The 1789 Revolution weakened the feudal order and ultimately defeated it, the Church lost its power and

position forever, the republic replaced the dynastic regime and bourgeoisie emerged as new dominant class.

There has been a controversy as to whether ideas or conditions were responsible for the French Revolution and this controversy will continue as long as there are philosophers and historians to stand for their respective positions. Whether the conditions, social and economic over which individual has little control, are enough to account for a great historical transformation like French Revolution or whether the intellectual forces in the shape of ideas of philosopher are necessary, is a question to be examined with thoroughness of facts and reason. French Revolution has been battleground both for materialists and idealists to prove their respective positions. Marx, the father of the philosophy of dialectical materialism, himself admits that ‘subjective forces’ or ideas play an important role in history that role is conditional on the objective reality. He explains the importance of individual role in his work *18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*:

“Men make their own history, but they do not make it as they please; they do not make it under self-selected circumstances, but under circumstances existing already, given and transmitted from the past. The tradition of all dead generations weighs like a nightmare on the brains of the living.”²

Lenin, the father of Russian socialist revolution and one of the greatest followers of Marxian philosophy, attached great importance to revolutionary ideas in changing the society. While chalking out methods of revolutionary strategy, he says: “there can be no revolutionary movement without a revolutionary theory.”³ Such a theory must help the mass of the people move from spontaneity revolutionary consciousness. A new way ahead is needed. Not to worship spontaneity, but to “reject subservience to and conciliation with what already exists”.⁴

The debate as to which factors, roughly classified as economic or intellectual, played more important part in brining about the French Revolution goes back to the Revolution itself when two points of view were stated by Mallet du Pan and Mournai.

Writers of Catholic Reaction like de Maistre and Bonald are in agreement with Babbitt in the US today that Rousseau, Voltaire and Encyclopedists were responsible for the evil destruction of ancient regime in France. Taine expounded the same view in detail as he describes France as healthy before drinking the cup of 'philosophic poison'. Rocquain, the theoretical adversary of Taine, argued that the Revolution arose out of the contest between King, Jesuits, and Parlement rather than any abstract ideas.⁵ Aubertin held the position similar to Rocquain. Champion demonstrated the importance of *Cahiers* of 1789 in the eruption of revolutionary sentiments. Faguet agreed with Champaion in his researches and held that so-called revolutionary philosophy was as old as Bayle and the philosopher would themselves did not want and would not have liked the revolution as it unfolded in the French situation.

M. Roustan in his work *The Pioneers of the French Revolution* as justly appreciated the influence of philosophic writings on different classes of the French society. Will Durant, the American historian of philosopher, argues that "Burke, de Tocqueville, and Taine agree that the philosophers of France, from Bayle to Mably, were major factor in bringing on the Revolution." The philosophers provided the ideological preparation for the Revolution. The causes were economical or political, the phrases were philosophical and the operation of the basic causes was smoothed by the demolition work of the philosophers in removing such obstacles to change as belief in feudal privileges, ecclesiastical authority, and the divine right of kings.⁶

Hegel, one of the greatest philosophers of all times, too was profoundly influenced by this great revolution and he contextualized it in the light of his conception of history. Hegel argues that history is not meaningless chance, but a rational process - the realization of the principle of freedom immanent in human consciousness.

He observes: "It has been said, that the French revolution resulted from philosophy, and it is not without reason that philosophy has been called "*weltweisheit*" (world wisdom)." For Hegel, the truth does not lie only in science but also in a philosophy "in its living form as exhibited in the affairs of the world. We should not, therefore, contradict the assertion that the revolution received its first impulse from philosophy."⁷

The 1789 French Revolution marks a new era in the history of mankind. It was as a result of the French Revolution that democracy replaced absolute monarchy and feudal order was destroyed and the Roman Catholic Church was forced to rethink its role in the modern state. France oscillated among the republic, empire and monarchy from the beginning of the Revolution to the total end of the Bourbons, the Revolution heralded the ideals of 'liberty, equality and fraternity' and as it marched beyond the frontiers of France to the remotest parts of Europe. It helped Europe leave behind the age of absolutism and aristocratic privileges and embrace the 'age of citizenry' as a new dominant political force. Hegel considers the French Revolution as a phenomenon of world-historical importance in the history of mankind when he says: "We have now to consider the French revolution in its organic connection with the history of the world; for in its substantial import that event is world-historical. As regards outward diffusion its principle gained access to almost all modern states, either through conquest or by express introduction into their political life. Particularly all the Romanic nations, and the Roman Catholic world in special - France, Italy, Spain - were subjected to the dominion of liberalism."⁸

François Furet, an ex-Marxist, made a far more sophisticated analysis of the French revolution and constructed a framework in this regard in his work of 1978 *Interpreting the French Revolution* in place of economic and social determinism of Marxists. The French Revolution was a cataclysmic event that changed the course of history. It went through a number of phases each with a different character, and each with numerous complexities. Furet placed an innovative intellectual history approach. Ideas and discourses were most important for understanding the revolution, and taking his cue from Tocqueville, these ideas may not be what the contemporaries thought they were. He stresses that the revolution was essentially a competition for power about and through words and symbols.⁹

The Enlightenment and French Revolution

The great French Revolution which took place at the end of 18th century was preceded by the ideological revolution known as the Enlightenment. The materialists of the Enlightenment were the most consistent fighters against feudal ideology. French philosophers of the 18th century, the forerunners of the Revolution, regarded the reason as the sole judge of all that is. A rational government, a rational society were to be founded and everything against reason was to be remorselessly set aside.¹⁰

The Enlightenment was an intellectual movement of second half of the 18th century which owed its origin to classical times and the Renaissance when humanism and rationalism were struggling to take the place of the dogma of the Church. French philosopher Descartes with his 'rationalistic approach and habit of systematic doubt', John Locke's empirically based political theory and Issac Newton's use of observation and experiment with his laws of motion and gravitation paved the way for the Enlightenment in the 18th century when these ideas were further developed by in France and publicized all over Europe in French, the international language of the time, in such works as Montequieu's *De l'Espirt des Lois* (1748), Condillac's *essai sur l'Origin des Conaissances Humaines* (1746), the *Encyclopedi* of Diderot and d'Alembert (1751 onwards), Voltaire's *Dictionnair Philosophique* (1746) and Rousseau' Contract Social and Emile (1762). Although these *philosophes* or philosophers did not from a school of thought, they subscribed together to a number of broad propositions.¹¹ Under the influence of ideals of the Renaissance, the Reformation, Scientific Revolution in physical sciences, these writers and *philosophes* established knowledge and discoveries on the basis of reason and observation without relying on authorities in a spirit of detachment

from medieval dogma. The thinkers of the Enlightenment also believed that human behaviour also followed laws which could be discovered by reason and observation, and which could be applied to morality, government, the economy and the social order. The popular coffee houses of Paris were the centers of intellectual activities and the people from all walks of life met there to exchange views about new philosophies. There were five basic ideas of the Enlightenment: reason, nature, happiness, progress and liberty. The doctrines of liberty and equality were the most talked about subjects of discussions in the times of privileged nobility and clergy when the privileged classes placed restrictions on the freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of trade at the time when the French intellect was expanding and seeking to experience fresh breeze of liberty and equality.

Perspectives on the French Revolution

The word *philosophe*, is used by French writers generally to describe Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, d'Alembert and the other advocates of reform in Church or State who were associated with them. "It would be to falsify history to deny to the philosophy the part they took in the Revolution.".. They are, and will remain in the future as in the past, the true creators of the Revolution."¹²

The peasants and the labourers who were already suffering from low income and low wages were prone to the influence of the ideas of these *philosophes*, "The ideas circulated among these social groups in the second half of the 18th century roused their resentment and sharpened their intellectual bite. They raised the quarrels from the humdrum level of material interest to the high plane of political principle. The press, the salons, the public libraries, the reading societies and the academies played a role of paramount importance in popularizing the ideas of philosophers among the people of France."¹³ A revolution has to be conceivable before it can take place, it is argued. So the intellectual origins have always been a major area of inquiry.

The Enlightenment did critique of society and institutions of despotism and the Church which laid the foundations for a new order. Historians of differing political persuasions, having different ideas of the nature of the revolution, have singled out several aspects of the eighteenth century ideologies. Ideas of liberty, equality, the fellowship of man against oppression and democracy as an idealized solution, have all been accorded an important role. The thinkers undermined the respect for the traditional elites and order of things. Hippolyte Taine (1828–1893) saw the French nation, even the peasants and artisans, thrown into turmoil by the babblings of *philosophes*.¹⁴

Different perspectives of analysis about the French Revolution colour the interpretations about the ideas which inspired it. The historians who see the revolution in the light of class struggle emphasize the social-political milieu of the French society in which the Enlightenment originated. They see the French revolution as the bourgeoisie revolution representing the interests of rising bourgeoisie whose growth was impeded by the privileged feudal class. They see the thought of *lumières* as the ideology of a new class being opposed by the privileged order of the day. There are also those historians who transcend the class lines and think some segments of nobility also participated in the revolution and maintain that class conflicts did not underlie the intellectual alignments of the eighteenth century. The right wing historians blame *philosophes* for the revolutionary disturbance and chaos while the left wing historians credit them with it.¹⁵

Relation between Idea and Material Circumstances

France was witnessing the horrible state of Catholic Church, the misery and degradation of mankind. The attacks of the philosophers on the Church and nobility were natural outcome of agony and torment the people were experiencing. Hegel appreciates their services in this regard. He says: “What a religion! Not the religion that Luther purified, but the most wretched superstition, priestly domination, stupidity, degradation of mind, and more especially the squandering of the riches and the reveling in temporal possession in the midst of public misery. And what a state! The blindest tyranny of ministers and their mistress, wives and chamberlains; so that a vast army of petty tyrants and idlers looked upon it as a right divinely given them to plunder the revenues of the state and lay

hands upon the product of the nation's sweat. Morals were simply in keeping with the corruptness of the institutions. We see the law defied by individuals in respect to civil and political life; we see it likewise set at naught in respect to conscience and thought.”¹⁶

Both the historians of the French Enlightenment and the French Revolution have endeavoured to relate the intellectual developments to social contexts. Clearly human beings do not accomplish great things if they are without any ideas about them. In the context of the great events like French Revolution, the ideas are necessary to give rise to such events in which human mind is zealously at work. Marx and Engels saw the French Enlightenment philosophers as being the intellectual ancestors of the revolutionary movement that was brewing up at that time. They paid tribute to them as follows: “The great men who in France were clearing the minds of men for the coming revolution themselves acted in an extremely revolutionary fashion. They recognized no external authority of any kind. Religion, concepts of nature, society, political systems, everything was subjected to the most merciless criticism; everything had to justify its existence at the bar of reason or renounce all.”¹⁷ The mind of revolutionaries was prepared by Montesquieu and Rousseau Voltaire and the authors of the Encyclopedia like Joucourt , Mably, Raynal, Holbach, d’Alembert and Diderot.

M. Rouston, a French historian whose celebrated work *The Pioneers of the French Revolution* provides deep insight into the intellectual forces at work in the French society looks on the role of *philosophes* as decisive in the revolution. He says, “The *philosophes*, having worked for the freeing of men's minds, had driven it into the brains of all their fellow-citizens that they were free men, and that among their inalienable rights they possessed that of founding a society in which these rights would not be for ever sacrificed. The citizens came to realize that their ills were not of Divine institution and were not inherent in a condition of things decreed by Providence, but that they resulted from a series of iniquities which it was now time to stop. They began to repeat without always understanding that ‘ I am prepared to agree the credo of the *philosophes*’. What came home to them was the reflection that nothing was happening in accordance with reason and justice, and that it rested with themselves, the people, that things should go in

accordance with reason and justice. Thenceforth, they were no longer content to bow their heads. Enlightened by the *philosophes* about the wrongs, enlightened by the *philosophes* regarding reforms, they built up their struggle for reforms. The *philosophes* always were the initiators. They furnished both the weapons and the principles.”¹⁸

Roustan disagrees with historians like Faguet and Rocquain who maintain that ancient regime was moribund and was likely to fall even earlier. Emile Faguet (1847-1916) in his work *Questions Politiques*, in the chapter entitled " *La France en 1789*" and M. Rocquain in his book, *Esprit Revolutionnaire avant la Revolution*, try to disprove the role of *philosophes* in the French revolution by maintaining that ancient regime was collapsing even in 1753.¹⁹

“Voltaire and Rousseau were the heralds of the change in ideas and actions of men; they popularized those invaluable shibboleths, *liberte*, and *egalite*, to the music of which middle class marched to political supremacy. Originally liberty meant freedom from feudal tyranny and tolls; originally equality meant the admission of middle classes, along with aristocracy and the clergy, to the honours and spoils of government; originally fraternity meant access of bankers and merchants, butchers and bakers and candlestick-makers, to aristocratic and Episcopal salons.”²⁰

The notion of liberty advocated by the philosophers was actually the freedom for free enterprise or *laissez faire* unhindered by feudal privileges and dogmatic clergy. The Physiocrats who represented the rising *bourgeoisie* emphasized the role of labour, workers and land. Say and Quesnay (1694-1744) were the driving force behind this movement. Economist or Physiocrats stood for the reduction of control of land by nobility and clergy and also for abolition of taxes levied on the *bourgeoisie* or the Third Estate. They demanded the free operation of their economic doctrine *laissez faire*. Engels has vividly highlighted the rationale of Age of Reason when he says: “This eternal reason was nothing else than the idealized intellect of the average *bourgeois*, developing just at that period. This was freedom from fetters of feudal property as this bourgeoisie had certainly developed rapidly even during revolution because the lands of nobility and of the Church were confiscated.”²¹ Marxists historians appreciating the dialectical relationship between

ideas and material conditions argue that the French Revolution came not only because ‘Voltaire wrote brilliant satires and Rousseau sentimental romances, but also because the middle classes had risen to economic leadership, needed legislative freedom for their enterprise and trade, and itched for social acceptance and political power.’²²

Thomson in *Europe since Napoleon* is of the view that the ideas of *philosophes* were not the cause of revolution as Rousstan thought but he admits that once the revolution started the ideas of *philosophes* started influencing the course of revolution.

“The 1789 French Revolution sought to give concrete expression to the ideas of the philosophers. In the first phase of the Revolution, Montesquieu’s moderate ideas were applied as a panacea to the ills which feudal France was afflicted with. There had been growing in Europe throughout most of the eighteenth century, what has been called ‘the revolutionary spirit’. This spirit of rational criticism and of resistance to the established powers of the Roman Catholic Church, the absolute monarchy, and the privileged nobility, was fostered particularly by the work of a remarkable series of French thinkers and literary men, the *philosophes*. The writings of men like Voltaire, Montesquieu, Diderot, and Rousseau were widely read throughout Europe and they themselves became figures of eminence and influence....They had fostered a critical and irreverent attitude toward all existing institutions. They made men more ready, when the need arose, to question the whole foundation of the old order.”²³

To sum up, the French Revolution is unique in many ways. The French people struggled to materialize the thoughts and ideals they were animated by and inspired with. The Revolution passed through many phases, each of which represented the endeavor on the part of the French people to experiment on their vision of liberty, equality and fraternity. As the revolutionaries replaced one set of ideas with another, they also went from one philosopher to another whose ideas represented the needs of the consciousness and conditions in which the revolutionaries found themselves. American Declaration of Independence was also one of the influential factors in the French revolutionary politics. What was advocated and what was acted upon during the Revolution was expressed in

terms that came from political and social philosophies of the thinkers of the Enlightenment or what we call the Age of Reason.

CHARLES DE SECONDAT, BARON DE MONTESQUIEU (1689 – 1755)

Montesquieu's thought has exerted dominant influence on the people who started the Revolution. His work in 1748, *The Spirit of Laws*, played a role in shaping the very structure of The Constitution of 3rd September 1791. Montesquieu studied various forms of national government and varied sources of political philosophy. He came to a conclusion that there were "three sorts of powers: the legislative power, the executive power of things which concern the rights of the people and the judicial power of the courts which concerns civil rights (the relations of the citizens with each other). He went on to explain that "all will be lost if only one man or group of people gained control of all three areas of power. Montesquieu emerged from that intellectual milieu of the eighteenth-century France in which revolution of ideas was taking shape and his revolutionary opinions on religion and the monarchy were well known. On one occasion he had even mocked the memory of Louis XIV in his work *Persian Letters*.²⁴

Montesquieu, himself an aristocrat, suggested that 'liberal constitutional monarchy' was the best system of government for the people of France who were aspiring to see themselves equal before law and prize freedom. He says: "In republican governments, men are all equal; equal they are also in despotic governments: in the former, because they are everything; in the latter, because they are nothing"(The Spirit of Laws Bk. VI).²⁵ "As distant as heaven is from the earth, so is the true spirit of equality from that of extreme equality." "In a true state of nature, indeed, all men are born equal, but they cannot continue in this equality. Society makes them lose it, and they recover it only by the protection of laws" (The Spirit of Laws Bk. VIII).²⁶

He argues against despotic government when he says:” As education in monarchies tends to raise and ennoble the mind, in despotic governments its only aim is to debase it. Here it must necessarily be servile; even in power such an education will be an advantage, because every tyrant is at the same time a slave. Excessive obedience supposes ignorance in the person that obeys: the same it supposes in him that commands, for he has no occasion to deliberate, to doubt, to reason; he has only to will. In despotic states, each house is a separate government. As education, therefore, consists chiefly in social converse, it must be here very much limited; all it does is to strike the heart with fear, and to imprint on the understanding a very simple notion of a few principles of religion. Learning here proves dangerous, emulation fatal; and as to virtue, Aristotle [3] cannot think that there is any one virtue belonging to slaves; if so, education in despotic countries is confined within a very narrow compass. (The Spirit of Laws Bk. IV).²⁷

Before 1789 Revolution, the Sovereign Courts had based their powers on historic rights and claimed to be the guardians of the fundamental laws of the kingdom. However, under the influence of the ideas of Montesquieu, the working of the courts changed and they adopted the role of ‘corps intermediaries’ and saw themselves as the link between the King and his subjects. This change is demonstrative of the way the King and his absolutist regime were slowly beginning to relinquish total power, and the views of the people were considered to be far more representative of those of the nation as a whole. According the historian, Alfred Cobban, ‘Montesquieu was trying to strike a balance between what he saw as the three main powers in France, and not at all proposing that there should be a complete separation.’²⁸

Montesquieu himself came from a privileged class; his ideas were not as radical as those of Rousseau for the peasants and labourers. Yet his thought proved to be of extraordinary importance as it provided for the checks on the authority of a monarch.

Lafayette, Mirabeau and other revolutionaries were inspired by his ideas as they were espousing the peaceful transition from absolutism to the rule of constitutional monarchy any bloodshed.

Montesquieu divided the sovereignty of the nation between several centers of power.

Separation of Powers is the principle of dividing the powers of a government among different branches to guard against abuse of authority. A government of separated powers assigns different political and legal powers to the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. Montesquieu lays down his principles thus:

“When the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person, or in the same body of magistrates, there can be no liberty; because apprehensions may arise, lest the same monarch or senate should enact tyrannical laws, to execute them in a tyrannical manner. Again, there is no liberty, if the judiciary power be not separated from the legislative and executive. Were it joined with the legislative, the life and liberty of the subject would be exposed to arbitrary control; for the judge would be then the legislator. Were it joined to the executive power, the judge might behave with violence and oppression.”²⁹ There would be an end of everything, were the same man or the same body, whether of the nobles or of the people, to exercise those three powers, that of enacting laws, that of executing the public resolutions, and of trying the causes of individuals. Were the legislative body to be a considerable time without meeting, this would likewise put an end to liberty. For of two things one would naturally follow: either that there would be no longer any legislative resolutions, and then the state would fall into anarchy; or that these resolutions would be taken by the executive power, which would render it, absolute. The English has achieved this by sharing sovereignty between the Crown, Parliament and law courts. Montesquieu suggested to the French that they needed estates with which they were already familiar—the crown, the aristocratic courts, the Church, the landed nobility and the chartered cities, the bourgeoisie. Montesquieu is in favor of giving a conspicuous share of sovereignty to the aristocracy—the class to which he belonged.

In the early phase of the Revolution, some of the most active people came from aristocracy who, though identified the cause of national freedom, acted having their own interests in mind. Louis XVI thought that some of his privileges subjects would follow the Whig nobility of England by making the monarch constitutional in an English fashion. Mirabeau, the leading orator among the revolutionaries was influenced by the

ideas of Voltaire and Montesquieu in demanding a constitutional monarchy. Montesquieu's vision became unrealizable because the nobility and the clergy stubbornly clung to their privileges with no signs of giving them up for the powers which Montesquieu had proposed for them. Instead, it was less privileged orders of the society known as the 'Third Estate or commoners who demanded to share the sovereignty of the nation with the Crown. Nevertheless, the division of sovereignty between Crown and legislature was still thought of as the central achievement of the Revolution of 1789. The influence of Montesquieu came in the distorted shape as Simon Schama, a historian, is of the opinion that is that 'by the time the Constitution was finally drawn up in 1791, the ideas of Montesquieu had been grossly taken out of context. Montesquieu had wanted power to pass smoothly from the absolutist court to an assembly dominated by the financial and judicial nobility, rather than threaten the established order itself.³⁰ The 1791 Constitution attacked the institution of monarchy and limited his powers, he was not absolute any longer and the chances of his conflict with the National Assembly were visible from the very beginning. The King was presented with the Constitution after he was brought from his place at Versailles to Paris where he was treated like a prisoner. The Constitution still recognized that King was 'inviolable and sacred' and the 'Monarchy is delegated hereditarily' but he was seen as the "King of the French" rather than as "King of France" as was formerly the case which meant that Louis XVI should remain as a king but relinquish his power over the nation and state. "The Constitution", wrote Nesta Webster, "was a mass of contradictions; it was neither democratic nor autocratic, neither republican nor monarchic, and consequently satisfied neither Royalists nor revolutionaries."³¹

Although Montesquieu's ideas profoundly influenced the shape of the Constitution, those who believed themselves to be implementing such ideas were in fact going much further than Montesquieu himself would have wanted. In the words of Camille Desmoulins, "there has been such a confusion of plans, and so many people have worked at it in contrary directions, that it is a veritable Tower of Babel." Montesquieu was heavily criticized for his reluctance to upset the applecart; not least by a young radical

known as Grouvelle, a Jacobin, who, in 1788, accused him of demonstrating the advantages of a government in which he occupied an advantageous place.³²

Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-78)

According to Mme. De Stael (1766-1817), a famous female French writer and intellectual, Napoleon ascribed the French Revolution more to Rousseau than to any other writer.³³ The influence of Rousseau is easily discernible from the beginning of the Revolution even when the idea of constitutional monarchy was being implemented. Rousseau's famous dictum that "Man was born free but every where is in chains"³⁴ finds its echo in the *Declaration of Rights of Man and the Citizens* adopted by the National Assembly of France on August 26, 1789.

"Men are born and remain free and equal in rights. Social distinctions may be founded only upon the general good.

The aim of all political association is the preservation of the natural and imprescriptible rights of man. These rights are liberty, property, security, and resistance to oppression.

The principle of all sovereignty resides essentially in the nation. No body nor individual may exercise any authority which does not proceed directly from the nation.

Liberty consists in the freedom to do everything which injures no one else; hence the exercise of the natural rights of each man has no limits except those which assure to the other members of the society the enjoyment of the same rights. These limits can only be determined by law.

Law can only prohibit such actions as are hurtful to society. Nothing may be prevented which is not forbidden by law, and no one may be forced to do anything not provided for by law.

Law is the expression of the general will. Every citizen has a right to participate personally, or through his representative, in its foundation. It must be the same for all, whether it protects or punishes. All citizens, being equal in the eyes of the law, are equally eligible to all dignities and to all public positions and occupations, according to their abilities, and without distinction except that of their virtues and talents.”

In his *History of Political Science*—the most comprehensive work of that kind which France possesses, Paul Janet, after a thorough presentation of the *Contrat Social*, discusses the influence which this work of Rousseau's exercised upon the Revolution. He traces idea of the declaration of rights back to Rousseau's teachings, although Professor Jellinek, a German expert in the constitutional history, argues that the American Declaration of Independence influenced the French Declaration of Rights of Man adopted by the French National Assembly in August, 1789.³⁵

The French romantic thinker of the Enlightenment Jean Jacques Rousseau was the main precursor of this great revolution. He was also called as Messiah of the Revolutionary Crisis. His writings were widely read in the French educated class and quoted as gospel almost by all leaders of the Revolution. . Rousseau 's doctrines were contained in an early essay on civilization, A Dissertation *On the Origin and Foundation of The Inequality of Mankind*, 1754, in his *Emile*, a treatise on Education, and in the *Social Contract*, which is his chief influence on the Revolution.

Edmund Burke, an English writer and critic of the French Revolution writes that in the French Revolutionary Constituent Assembly (1789-91) “there is a great dispute among their leaders, which of them is the best resemblance of Rousseau. In truth, they resemble him.... Him they study, him they meditate; him they turn over in all the time they can spare from the laborious mischief of the days or the debauches of the night. Rosseau is their canon of Holy Writ; ...to him they erect their statue.”³⁶

Rousseau was considered threat to the ancient regime and he was exiled many a time and his books like *Emile* were still banned and burned, but their ashes helped to disseminate their ideals. Mallet Dupan in 1799 recalled that: “Rousseau had a hundred times more readers among the middle and lower classes than Voltaire. He alone inoculated the French with the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people... It would be difficult to cite a single revolutionist who was not transported over these anarchical theories, who did not burn with ardor to realize them.... I heard Marat in 1788 read and comment on the *Contract Social* in the public streets to the applause of an enthusiastic auditory.”

³⁷“Throughout France orators quoted Rousseau in preaching the sovereignty of the people; it was partly the ecstatic welcome given to this doctrine that enabled the Revolution to survive for a decade despite its enemies and its excesses... Throughout all the alternations of revolutions and reaction, Rousseau’s influence on politics continued. Because of the force and passion with which he proclaimed them, he served as prophet and saint to anarchists and socialist alike; for both these opposed gospels found nourishment in his condemnation of the rich and his sympathy for the poor.” ‘Jefferson derived the Declaration of Independence from Rousseau as well as from Locke and Montesquieu.’”³⁸

The classification of the French Revolution as the republican revolution is also largely traceable to Rousseau. When Louis XVI fled to Vergennes in 1791, the king’s action to flee his own people dealt a stern blow to his liberal reputation and his eagerness to become constitutional monarch. The French Republican impulse began to express itself first as a loss of trust in the capacity of the monarch to guard the interests of his people. Criticizing the monarchy, Rousseau says: “An essential and inevitable defect, which will always make the monarchical government inferior to republican government, is that whereas in republics the popular choice almost always elevates to the highest places only intelligent and capable men, who fill their office with honor, those who rise under monarchies are nearly always muddled little minds, petty knaves and intriguers with small talents which enable them to rise to high places in courts, but which betray their ineptitude to the public as soon as they are appointed.”³⁹ Republicanism became the

popular ideal of revolutionary programme. Montesquieu's conception of liberty gave place to the Rosseauean conception of equality and freedom. Montesquieu considered the freedom as being 'uncontained' in doing what it chooses so long as it is lawful. Rousseau defined freedom as ruling oneself: "Liberty is the distinguishing feature of man. To renounce his liberty signifies to renounce his manhood. Not to be free is therefore a renunciation of a man's right as a human being, and even of his duties." Rousseau explains his concept of the Republic which is inextricably linked with his concept of freedom thus: "since each man gives himself to all, he gives himself to no one; and since there is no associate over whom he does not gain the same rights as others gain over him, each man recovers the equivalent of everything he loses, and in the bargain he acquires more power to preserve what he has..... Immediately, in place of the individual person of each contacting party, this act of association creates an artificial and collective body composed of as many members as there are voters in the assembly, and by this same act that body acquires its unity, its common ego, its life and its will. The public person thus formed by the union of all other person was once called the city, and is now known as the 'republic' or the body politic. In its passive role it is called the *state* and when it plays an active role it is the *sovereign*; when it is compared to others of its own kind, it is a power..... This formula shows that the act of association consists of a reciprocal commitment between society and the individual.⁴⁰ Rousseau's philosophy of freedom leave no possibility of 'people dividing and diminishing sovereignty because the people were to keep sovereignty in their own hands.' The conception of freedom drawn in the light of Rousseau's ideas, nation becomes sovereign over itself.

On June 17, 1789, the deputies of the Estates General, which had been convoked previously by the King Louis XVI resolved that they were no longer assembled at the monarch's behest but rather were agents of the national will entrusted with representing the sovereignty of the people of France. The three estates thereby constituted themselves as a single *Assemblée nationale* or National Assembly. This was the inauguration of modern politics and four weeks later when Bastille fell, the signs of first democratic republic and first genuine nation-state appeared. Criticizing the monarchy, Rousseau

says: "An essential and inevitable defect, which will always make the monarchical government inferior to republican government, is that whereas in republics the popular choice almost always elevates to the highest places only intelligent and capable men, who fill their office with honor, those who rise under monarchies are nearly always muddled little minds, petty knaves and intriguers with small talents which enable them to rise to high places in courts, but which betray their ineptitude to the public as soon as they are appointed."⁴¹

The second phase of Revolution from September, 1792 to Napoleonic coup d'état in November 1799 in which the republican ideas found their concrete expression in the actions of the revolutionaries may be described as the 'Republican Phase for which Rousseau did not only furnish terminology of revolutionary discourse but was generally acknowledged to have done so'.

Rousseau and The Reign of Terror (1793-94)

The exigencies of the time--war, counterrevolution, factionalism within the various governments--combined to tempt the revolutionary leaders to adopt radical measures.

The Committee of Public Safety came under the control of Maximilien Robespierre, and the Jacobins unleashed the Reign of Terror (1793-1794). The most influential factor in this decision was the war and fear of foreign invasion, as the "Declaration of Revolutionary Government," issued on October 10, 1793, succinctly stated: "The provisional government of France is revolutionary until the peace." Put otherwise, revolutionary times required revolutionary, not democratic, government. The now familiar arguments about "national security" were then new, but no less disturbing. Between 18,000 and 40,000 people were guillotined during the Reign of Terror. The revolutionary tribunals meted out hasty justice. Opponents of the regime, revolutionaries themselves, fell beneath the blade of the guillotine. This was the awful period in which "the Revolution devoured its own children." On 27 July 1794, the Thermidorian Reaction led to the arrest and execution of Robespierre and Saint-Just.

Rousseau rejected the validity of all established morality, religion, customs and institutions. Nothing external to the individual could claim any authority. His personal conscience was the supreme judge of morality. Only that to which the individual gave his free consent was binding on his will. The will of each individual, unrestricted and unguided by anything except his own deeply felt conception of virtue or the common good, was the foundation of law and political association. “The word ‘right’ adds nothing to what is said by ‘force’; it is meaningless. The precept ‘Obey those in power’ is sound, but superfluous; it has never, I suggest, been violated. All power comes from God, I agree; but so does every disease, and no forbids us to summon a physician... Surely, it must be admitted, then, that might does not make right, and that duty of obedience is owed only to legitimate powers.”⁴²

In a long passage in the *Philosophy of Right* Hegel attributes the excesses of the French Revolution to Rousseau's ideas on will, consent and freedom, and to 'the reduction of the union of individuals in the state to a contract and therefore to something based on their arbitrary will'. When these abstract conclusions came into power, they afforded for the first time in human history the prodigious spectacle of the overthrow of the constitution of a great actual state and its complete reconstruction *ab initio* on the basis of pure thought alone, after the destruction of all existing and given material. The will of its founders was to give it what they alleged was a purely rational basis, but it was only abstractions that were being used; the Idea [the true concept of community] was lacking; and the experiment ended in the maximum of frightfulness and terror. “⁴³ The same idea of course Hegel had expressed thirteen years earlier in the brilliant chapter on 'Absolute freedom and terror' in the *Phenomenology of Spirit* (1807). “Numerous passages in Hegel’s philosophical and political writings explain how he thought that the notion of an absolutely universal free will as conceived by Rousseau was responsible both for inaugurating the French Revolution in its overthrow of ancient regime and subsequently producing the Terror.”⁴⁴

Hegel offers another parallel to Robespierre who is the famous constitutionalist Abbe Sieyes who, too, was, inspired with Rousseau, but he upheld the modern and enlightened

content in the Rousseauian thought whereas the Robespierre represented the abstraction of false theories in Rousseau's philosophy and 'brought to its dreadful climax.'⁴⁵ There was nothing to ensure that the General Will *de facto* differed from the will of all or the will of the majority. Rousseau confused the truth that there could be no freedom without the consent of one's mind and will with the very different proposition that such consent constituted freedom. Without an external, objective, rational principle to guide our will it becomes arbitrary and amoral. By systematically rejecting all established order as the source of such principles Rousseau ended with no ethical leg to stand on. The logical consequence of Rousseau's approach when followed in practice was the dissolution of all society, community and state.⁴⁶

Rousseau never abandons the belief, put forward in his *discourse sur l' inegalite* (*Discourse on the origin of inequality*) that men are happy in the state of nature. He continues to think it possible for them to be good...Rousseau disagrees with Hobbes' idea that man must choose between being free and being ruled. He says: "Men can both be ruled and free if they rule themselves. For what is a free man but a man who rules himself? A people can be free if it retains sovereignty over itself..... Civilization is bound to change men, and if it does not do what it is meant to do and improve them, it will worsen them."⁴⁷ Rousseau is passionately attached to liberty and idea of mankind's innocence in a state of nature and his belief in ethical simplicity of uncultured people. Hegel regards such conception of freedom held by Rousseau as idea leading to the Reign of the Terror. The true purpose of "World, Spirit remarks Hegel, is to eliminate the natural simplicity, immediacy and individuality in any such state." He observes that the political consequences of Rousseau's mistake were devastating, and the Terror was the immediate afterbirth of French Revolution because the 'abstraction of false theories' when invested with power unleashed a spectacle in human history came to be known as the Reign of Terror.⁴⁸ Whereas Hegel thinks Rousseau's ideas were responsible for the Reign of Terror, Marx using his materialist dialectics draws a very novel conclusion from the same premises: " Robespierre, Saint-Just and their party fell because they confused the primitive, realistic-democratic commonweal based on the real slavery with the

modern idealistic-democratic representative state, which is based on emancipated slavery, bourgeois society.”⁴⁹

The Jacobins suffered terrible illusion when they sought to materialize man’s freedom in the state of nature in a society which was moving towards capitalistic mode of production. This is regarded by Hegel as the ‘abstract notion of freedom’ in Rousseauian philosophy. According to Rousseau the people could only be free if it ruled itself. He suggested the cult of civic religion should be established in place of Christianity. Man can be forced to be free he authorized the head of the Republic to overrule the dictates of private conscience together with the use of state power to suppress crime and immortality.

ROUSSEAU’S INFLUENCE ON ROBESPIERRE

Rousseau’s idea of the Republic influenced the Robespierre and Jacobins’ rule of popular sovereignty known in history as the Reign of Terror. Robespierre, following Rousseau, sought the support of religious beliefs in maintaining moral order and social content. “Rousseau, he said, had risen above these cowards, had bravely attacked all kings, and had spoken in defense of God and immortality... Robespierre had seen Rousseau in the philosophers, when he stayed in Paris. He apostrophized Jean-Jacques: “Divine man! I looked upon your august features; I understood all the griefs of a noble life devoted to worship of truth.”⁵⁰ When Robespierre rose to power he persuaded the National Convention to adopt the Profession of Faith of Savoyard Vicar as the official religion of the French Nation; and in May, 1794, he inaugurated, in memory of Rousseau, the Festival of the Supreme Being. When he sent Hebert and others to guillotine on a charge of atheism, he felt that he was following to the letter the counsel of Rousseau. ‘For two years, the Social Contract was the Bible of the Revolution.’⁵¹ Writing on the impact of philosophers on the French Revolution, Will Durant says: “The leader of the masses had lost respect for priests and kings... After October 6, 1789, the Jacobins controlled Paris, and Rousseau was their god. On November 10, 1793, the triumphant radicals celebrated in the Cathedral of Notre-Dame the Feast of Reason. At Tours the

revolutionaries replaced the statues of saints with new figures called Mably, Rousseau and Voltaire.⁵¹ Robespierre exploited the ‘Theory of Social Contract’ and Rosseauean language to disguise his political ambitions while distorting several of Rousseau’s ideas in the course of the repressive reign of Terror.⁵² The idea of nation’s being sovereignty over itself continued to command a widespread and dominant assent in France, and no French King was ever able to secure his throne after this principle became deeply ingrained in the French national consciousness. “Who (Robespierre) had a mystical faith in the need for a ‘Republic of Virtue’. The word ‘Virtue’ had echoes of both Machiavelli and Montesquieu for whom it is Rousseau who had added to it a more sentimental flavor of personal purity and incorruptibility”⁵³

The end of Robespierre did not mean the end of French Republicanism. The Rousseuean idea that the ‘nation might be sovereign over itself’ continued to command widespread and profound respect in France. “No French king was ever able to be secure on his throne after that belief took root in the French national consciousness.

Francois Marie Arouet Voltaire (1694-1778)

Napoleon Bonaparte overthrew the Directory in November 1799 which led to another phase of the Revolution. Napoleon found Voltaire's doctrine of 'enlightened despotism' of great service to his rule. Napoleon adopted the principle of religious tolerance but he could not ignore the appeal to masses of whom Voltaire had suspicions which he expresses: "Bonaparte felt two influences in the usual sequence: "Until I was sixteen", he recalled, "I would have fought for Rousseau against the friends of Voltaire; today it is opposite... The more I read Voltaire, the more I love him. He is a man always reasonable, never charlatan, never a fanatic."⁵⁴

Voltaire with his characteristic wit doubts if people should every have a say in the government: "Under which tyranny would you like to live? Under none but if had to choose I should detest less the tyranny of one that the tyranny of several. A despot always has some good moments; an assembly of despots never has any... for a company of grave tyrants is inaccessible." When a correspondent argued with him that monarchy is the best form of government, Voltaire replies: "Provided Marcus Aurelius is monarch, for otherwise what difference does it make to a poor man whether he is devoured by a lion or by a hundred rats?"⁵⁵ Voltaire, unlike Rousseau, had serious doubts about the masses' role in the government and politics. When the people undertake to reason, all is lost... When an old error is established politics uses it as a morsel which the people have put into their own mouths, until another superstition comes along to destroy this one and

politics profits from the second error as it did from the first.”“Voltaire seemed too conservative, too scornful of the masses, too much of seigneur; Robespierre rejected him.

The term ‘enlightened despotism’ came from Voltaire’s description of the Russian queen Catherine the great as ‘enlightened despot’. The monarchs who were influenced by the ideals of the Enlightenment and made *raison d’état* rather than the Divine Right as the basis of their rule came to be known as the ‘enlightened despots. Catherine considered herself philosopher and Voltaire called her the ‘Star of the North’. The theory of ‘enlightened despotism’ kept the sovereignty undivided as was the case in Rousseau’s *Social Contract* when the people were the sovereign but in Voltaire’s case this sovereignty was not transmitted to the people but it was kept by the monarch in his own hands. Voltaire saw no immediate threat to freedom in the strong centralized monarchical system as, for him, the intolerance practiced by the Church and the institutions controlled by the nobility constituted the real threat to liberty of the people. A single power that can subdue these threats is needed and there is no need for the different powers of centers to counterbalance each other as was the case in Montequiue’s philosophy of the ‘Separation of Powers’ Napoleon made the ‘Volatarean project’ his own after he seized the power but he could not ignore the role of the masses of whom Voltaire had suspicions. He held plebiscite and involved the French people to strengthen his grip on the power structure. Napoleon was conscious of the necessity that once the people have been brought into political arena by the revolutionary processes it was not possible to ignore them so to that extent he went against Voltaire’s philosophy of ‘enlightened despotism’ from necessity. “They had only to be persuaded to let themselves be led and Napoleon proved something of a genius in doing this.” During fifteen years of his rule both as a Consulate and an emperor, Napoleon benefitted immensely from the institutions which the preceding phases of the Revolution have produced and which the ideals of the Enlightenment inspired. Professor Peter Campbell is of the view that Napoleon clothed Voltairean enlightened despotism with the language and trappings of Rousseau republicanism.

Voltaire and the Catholic Clergy

Voltaire shared in begetting the French Revolution by weakening the respect of the intellectual class for the Church, and for the belief of the aristocracy in its feudal rights. Voltaire by his wit scorched the reverence remaining in the minds of men for the forms of the old outworn feudal-Catholic organization⁵⁶.

Voltaire expresses his uncompromising views about religious intolerance thus: “I believe that the persecutor is abominable, and that he ranks immediately after the poisoner and the parricide. I believe that theological disputes are at once the world’s most ridiculous farce and most frightful scourge, immediately after war, pestilence, famine and the pox.”⁵⁷

Napoleon seems to have acted upon Voltaire’s advice when he restored the Catholic Church but made the clergy subservient to the government. Voltaire tells about the ways to deal with the clergy thus: “Priests are in a state more or less what tutors are in the homes of its citizens: employed to teach, pray, and set an example. They have no authority over the masters of the house unless it can be proved that he who pays the wages must obey him who receives them. The religion of Jesus is unquestionably that which most positively excludes priests from all civil authority.... Prayer is not domination, exhortation is not despotism. ..The magistrates should sustain and restrain the priests, as children and prevent them from taking advantage of that respect. The accord of priesthood and empire is the most monstrous of systems.”⁵⁸ He voices the same sentiments in another place of this celebrated work thus: “I believe that the clergy should be paid, well paid, as servants of the public, teachers of marvels, custodians of the registers of children and deaths; but that they should be given neither the wealth of tax-collectors nor the rank of princes, because the one and the other corrupt the should, and nothing , is more revolting than to see men so rich and so proud make people with wages of only a hundred *ecus* preach humility and the love of poverty.”⁵⁹

Chamfort, while the Revolution was in process, wrote that, “the priesthood was the first bulwark of absolute power, and Voltaire overthrew it.”⁶⁰ In 1765, a man by the name La Barre, aged sixteen was arrested on the charge of blasphemy against Christianity. His

head was cut off at the order of clerical authority and then his body was flung into flames. A copy of Voltaire's *Philosophical Dictionary* which was found with him was also burned. Voltaire's intellectual rage boiled over this atrocity he began to pour forth such intellectual fire and brimstone as melted miters and scepters, broke the power of the priesthood in France, and helped to overthrow a throne. He sent out a call to his friends and followers, summoning them to battle: "Come brave Diderot, intrepid d'Alembert, ally yourselves;... overwhelm the fanatics and the knaves, destroy the insipid declamations, the miserable sophistries, the lying history... the absurdities, without number, don not let those who have sense to be subjected to those who have none, and the generation which is being born will owe to us its reason and liberty."⁶¹ While praising the Chinese religion and criticizing the European Christians he says: "The religion of the scholars is admirable. No superstition, no absurd legends, none of those dogmas that insult reason and nature and to which bonzes give a thousand different meanings because they have none....They are content to worship a god with all the wise men of the world, when in Europe men are divided between Thomas and Bonaventura, between Calvin and Luther, between Jansen and Molina."⁶² Voltaire seeks to disprove the prevailing view that morality has its origin in the religious dogma and bases morality on reason and good sense of a human being. He says, "There is not morality in superstition, it is not in ceremonies, it has not nothing in common with dogmas. It can not be too often repeated that all dogmas are different, and that morality is the same among all men who use their reason."⁶³

INFLUENCE OF VOLTAIRE'S THOUGHT ON RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE

Voltaire's idea of tolerance is tersely put in his famous dictum: "I don't agree with a word you say but I shall defend to death your right to say it."⁶⁴ Will Durant explains why revolution in France was violent in contrast to the revolutions which happened in other European countries give philosophical appraisal of influence of thought of Voltaire: "The most profound and lasting influence of Voltaire has been on religious belief. Through him and his associate France bypassed the Reformation, and went directly from the

Renaissance to the Enlightenment. Perhaps that is one reason why change was so violent; there was no pause at Protestantism.⁶⁵ No other philosopher of the Enlightenment has highlighted the rationale of virtue of *tolerance* more profoundly than Voltaire did. To Voltaire, more than to any other individual, we owe the religious toleration that now precariously prevails in Europe and North America. He gathered into one voice all the varieties of the anti-Catholic thought; he gave them added force by clarity, repetition and wit; and for a time it seemed as if he has pulled down the Temple in which he had been reared. .the intellectual classes throughout Christendom were move by the philosophes to a polite deism or secret atheism.⁶⁶ in his famous work *Treatise on Tolerance*, he says: “Of what is toleration? It is the prerogative of humanity. We all steeped in the weakness and errors: let us forgive one another’s follies, it the first law of nature (Ch. 23).”⁶⁷

He uses his wit to expose the contradiction between words and deed of the Catholic clergy of his times: “Of all religions the Christian is undoubtedly that which should instill the greatest toleration, although so far the Christians have been the most intolerant of all men.”⁶⁸ Voltaire’s ideas of religious tolerance and primacy of reason over dogmas owe their popularity to the *salon* (drawing-room) culture. Voltaire achieved the results by making unprecedented use of faculty of reason to ‘reproduce in words the shapeless thoughts of millions. Voltaire shows very profound understanding how the dying fanaticism acts when it is confronting rationality. “When a hundred academics have devoted their energies to the promotion of decency and gentleness in public affairs, religious fanaticism, infuriated by the advance of Reason, is thus seen to thrash about in agony of frustration and renewed spite.”⁶⁹ It would be the height of folly to pretend to improve all men to the point that they think in a uniform manner about metaphysics. it would be easier to subjugate the entire universe through force of arms than to subjugate the minds of a single village(Ch.21).⁷⁰ Voltaire uses the weapon of wit in his armour of literary idea to disarm the Catholic clergy of fanaticism: “May all men remember that they are brothers! May they hold in horror tyranny exerted over souls, just as they do the violence which forcibly seizes the products of peaceful industry! And if the scourge of war is inevitable, let us not hate one another, let us not destroy one another in the midst of

peace, and let us use the moment of our existence to bless, in a thousand different languages, from Siam to California, your goodness which has given us this moment.”⁷¹ Voltaire robbed the Catholic church of the esteem it enjoyed in France before the Revolution by using the reason in this way: “Men have made use of confession, communion, and all the other sacraments, to commit the most horrible crimes: therefore there is no God.” I should conclude, on the contrary: Therefore there is a God who, after this transitory life, in which we have known him so little, and committed so many crimes in his name, will vouchsafe to console us for our misfortunes. For, considering the wars of religion, the forty papal schisms (nearly all of which were bloody), the impostures which have nearly all been pernicious, the irreconcilable hatreds lit by differences of opinion, and all the evils that false zeal has brought upon them, men have long suffered hell in this world.”⁷² He harshly treats the intolerant practices of the Church: “You say that there is a great difference; that all other religions are the work of man, and the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church alone is the work of God. But, surely, the fact that our religion is divine does not imply that it should rule by hatred, fury, exile, the confiscation of goods, imprisonment, torture, murder, and thanksgiving to God for murder? The more divine the Christian religion is, the less it is the place of man to command it; if God is its author, he will maintain it without your aid. You know well that intolerance begets only hypocrites or rebels. Fearful alternative! Would you, indeed, sustain by executioners the religion of a God who fell into the hands of executioners, and who preached only gentleness and patience?”⁷³

Voltairean ideas were at work in the legislation of 13 February 1790 that abolished monastic vows. The Civil Constitution of the Clergy, passed on 12 July 1790 turned the remaining clergy into employees of the State and required that they take an oath of loyalty to the constitution. The Civil Constitution of the Clergy also made the Catholic Church an arm of the secular state. The archbishop of Aix and the bishop of Clermont protesting against this legislation led a walkout of clergy from the National Constituent Assembly. The pope never accepted the new arrangement, and it led to a schism between those clergy who swore the required oath and accepted the new arrangement ("jurors" or

"constitutional clergy") and the "non-jurors" or "refractory priests" who refused to do so. The ensuing years saw violent repression of the clergy, including the imprisonment and massacre of priests throughout France. In 1793, Hebert and Chaumette, wrongly interpreting Voltaire, established in Paris the atheistic worship of Goddess of Reason, a year later Robespierre, fearing chaos and inspired by Rousseau, set up the worship of the Supreme Being. The Concordat of 1801 between Napoleon and the Church ended the de-Christianization period and established the rules for a relationship between the Catholic Church and the French State that lasted until it was abrogated by the Third Republic via the separation of church and state on 11 December 1905.

COMPARISON BETWEEN ROUSSEAU AND VOLTAIRE

Not all Enlightenment thinkers were like Voltaire in their thoughts. His chief adversary was Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who distrusted the aristocrats not out of a thirst for change but because he believed they were betraying decent traditional values. He opposed the theater which was Voltaire's lifeblood, shunned the aristocracy which Voltaire courted, and argued for something dangerously like democratic revolution. Whereas Voltaire argued that equality was impossible, Rousseau argued that inequality was not only unnatural, but that, when taken too far--it made decent government impossible.

Whereas Voltaire charmed with his wit, Rousseau ponderously insisted on his correctness, even while contradicting himself. Whereas Voltaire insisted on the supremacy of the intellect, Rousseau emphasized the emotions, becoming a contributor to both the Enlightenment and its successor, romanticism. And whereas Voltaire endlessly repeated the same handful of core Enlightenment notions, Rousseau sparked off original thoughts in all directions: ideas about education, the family, government, the arts, and whatever else attracted his attention. For Rousseau, equality was the most precious of things that a human being possessed whereas Voltaire thought equality does not exist in the state of nature. He concludes: "Thus all men would necessarily be equal if they were without needs. The poverty characteristic of our species subordinated one man to

another. It is not inequality that is the real evil, but dependence. It matters very little that some man is called his highness, and another is holiness; but it is hard to serve one or the other.”⁷⁴ On the same question he writes: Every man is born with a powerful enough desire for domination, wealth and pleasure, and with much taste for idleness. Consequently, every man would like to have other’s people money and wives or women, to be their masters, to subjugate them to all his caprices, and to nothing, or at least to do only very agreeable things. Obviously, having such amiable dispositions, it is impossible for men to be equal as it is impossible for two preachers or two professors of theology not to be jealous of another.”⁷⁵

Voltaire and Rousseau also disagreed on the notion of liberty. For Voltaire, “those who say that all men are equal speak the greatest truth if they mean that all men have equal right to liberty and to the possession of their goods and to the protection of laws.”⁷⁶ He also says, “To be free is to be subject to nothing but the laws.” Durant commenting on Voltaire’s views about liberty says: “This was the note of the liberals, of Turgot and Condorcet and Mirabeau and other followers who did not quite satisfy the oppressed, who cared not so much for liberty, but for equality even at the cost of liberty. Rousseau, voice of common man, sensitive to the class distinctions which met him at every turn, demanded a leveling; and when the Revolution fell into the hands of his followers, Marat and Robespierre, equality had its turn, and liberty was guillotined.”⁷⁷ Rousseau had little faith in Voltaire’s reason. Voltaire believed that through education and reason man could separate himself from the beasts while Rousseau thought that it was precisely all this which made men "unnatural" and corrupted. Rousseau desired action and risks of revolution did not frighten him. He trusted the sentiments of fraternity present in human nature which in his view could re-unite the social elements scattered by turmoil and the uprooting of ancient habits. Let laws be removed, and men would pass into reign of equality and justice. When Rousseau sent to Voltaire his *Discourses on the Origin of Inequality*, with its argument against civilization, letters and sciences, and for a return to the natural condition as seen in savages and animals, Voltaire rejects the Rousseauian argument with his characteristic wit: “ I have received, sir, your new book against human

species, and I thank you for it. ... No one has ever been so witty as you are in trying to turn us into brutes; to read your book makes one long to go on all fours. As, however, it is now some sixty years since I gave up the practice, I feel that it is unfortunately impossible for me to resume it.”⁷⁸ Voltaire is not persuaded by Rousseau that man is by nature good but he insists that man is by nature a beast which needs reason and civilization. Bertrand Russell put it so eloquently: "It is not surprising that Rousseau and Voltaire ultimately quarreled, but the marvel is they did not quarrel sooner."

For all their personal differences, the two philosophers shared more values than they liked to acknowledge. They viewed absolute monarchy as dangerous and evil and rejected orthodox Christianity. Though Rousseau often struggled to seem more devout, he was almost as much a sceptic as Voltaire: the minimalist faith both shared was called "deism," and it was eventually to transform European religion by influencing other aspects of society as well.

Across the border in Holland, the merchants, who exercised most political power, there industry made immense profits out of publishing the books by these philosophers that could not be printed in countries like France. Dissenting religious groups mounted radical attacks on Christian orthodoxy. Voltaire and his allies in France, struggling to assert the values of freedom and tolerance in a culture where the twin fortresses of monarchy and Church opposed almost everything they stood for. It is crucial to understand that at his time, organized religion in France (and elsewhere) ranged itself on the opposite side of every one of these issues, censoring the press and speech, opposing religious toleration, supporting the doctrine of the divine right of kings to rule and often endorsing slavery as well. Voltaire railed against the Catholic Church not because he was a wicked man who wanted freedom to sin, but because he viewed it as a fountainhead and bulwark of evil. He felt that no change of the kind he wanted was possible without undermining the power of the Church; that is why he devoted so much of his attention to ridiculing and discrediting it.

When Voltaire died, he was refused burial in Paris due to his relentless criticism of the Catholic Church and nobility. His friends set him up in a carriage, and got him out of the city by pretending that he was alive. At Scellieres, his body was buried in holy ground. At the sitting of Sunday, 8th May, 1791, Regnaud proposed that remains of Voltaire must be transferred from the church at Sellieres to that at Romilly leaving the final decision to the National Assembly. Freilhard spoke thus: "I will remind you that Voltaire in 1764, in a private letter which he wrote, foretold this revolution of which we are witnesses: he foretold it just as we see it; he felt that it might be delayed awhile, that his eyes would not be witnesses of it, but that the children of that generation would benefit by it to the full. Therefore it is to him that we owe it; and he is, perhaps, one of the foremost among those to whom we owe the honours which you are proposing to confer upon the great men who have deserved well of the Country. I do not speak here of Voltaire's conduct as a private individual ; that he should have honoured the human race, that he should be the author of a revolution so beautiful and so great as ours, is sufficient reason for us to hasten to render to him as speedily as possible the honours which are his due. The Assembly accepted Regnaud's motion at once."⁷⁹ The National Assembly of the triumphant Revolution forced Louis XVI to recall Voltaire's remains to the Pantheon. The dead ashes of the great flames that had been escorted through Paris by a procession of 100,000 men and women, while 600,000 flanked the streets. The sentiments of the onlookers knew no bounds. On the funeral car, the tributes were offered to him in these words: "He gave the human mind a great impetus; he prepared us for freedom."⁸⁰ His mind is everywhere and his heart is here." Thy creative breath made us what we are. Accept the freely accorded homage of France kneeling before thee."⁸¹

Encyclopedists

Just at the side of Montesquieu, Rousseau and Voltaire stood the Encyclopedists led by Diderot (1713-84) and d'Alembert (1717-83). The great work of reference which they issued penetrated the intellectual circles not only of France but of Europe and brought with it the doctrines of materialism and atheism.⁸² "Encyclopedists" is the name usually applied to those *philosophers* and men of letters who collaborated in the writing of the famous Encyclopedie, or were in sympathy with its principles. The work was planned by Denis Diderot; he planned this work, and he announced it as a *Dictionnaire raisonne des sciences, des arts, et des metiers*. D'Alembert assisted him in this project. The intention was to provide a complete alphabetical treatment of the whole field of human knowledge from the standpoint of the "Enlightenment". The contributors included a number of remarkable men. A large part of the work was done by the Chevalier de Jaucourt, a man of encyclopedic learning. When he died in 1755, Montesquieu left behind an unfinished article on "Taste." Voltaire wrote some articles, and constantly advised on the development of the plan. Rousseau contributed articles on music, but ultimately quarreled with the editors, whose plan was so different from his. Turgot wrote on economic subjects, and in the latter part of the work Haller, the physiologist, and Condorcet were engaged. The first volume appeared in 1751, the second in the following January, and immediately excited the antagonism of the Church and the conservatives. On February 12, 1752, the two volumes were suppressed by the Council, as containing maxims

contrary to royal authority and to religion. The privileged classes felt threatened and the further publication was suspended for eighteen months. After the seventh volume, the forces of conservatism rallied to a fresh attack. The sale of the volumes already printed; as well as the printing of any more, was forbidden. Diderot, however, made his plans to continue privately to prepare the remaining volumes. D'Alembert withdrew, but Diderot toiled on and completed the work (28 volumes, Paris, 1751-72). Andre Francois Lebreton acquired a large interest in the undertaking and all the contributions were set up as they were written, but when Diderot had corrected the last proof, Lebreton and his foreman, without informing his partners, secretly cut out such parts from each articles as he thought too radical or likely to give offense. In this way many of the best articles were mutilated, and to prevent the restoration of the eliminated matter, Lebreton burned the original manuscripts. Subsequently a supplement was published (5 volumes, Amsterdam, Paris, 1776-77), also an index (2 volumes, 17880). The *Encyclopedie* carried immense wealth of material and polemical arsenal. It was prepared with the idea in mind that if civilization should by entirely destroyed, mankind might turn to these volumes to learn to reconstruct it. The editors of the Encyclopaedia had not neglected economic questions, and had given much employment to a number of writers who ranked as Economists or as Physiocrats. Among the men most interested in such questions were Quesnay, the physician of Madame de Pompadour; Turgot, the ablest minister of Louis XVI, and the Marquis de Mirabeau.⁸³

Education of Public Opinion

The Encyclopedia was in fact the collective effort of over one hundred French thinkers. The central purpose of the work was to secularize learning and, above all other things, to refute what the authors felt were dangerous carry-overs from the Middle Ages. For the Encyclopedists, human improvement was not a religious issue, but simply a matter of mastering the natural world through science and technology and mastering human passions through an understanding of how individuals and societies work.

The Encyclopedia shows embody the spirit of the Enlightenment as part of a process of publicity. They got their ideas into all the reading public's minds. About 25,000 were sold, half outside France. Encyclopaedia, developed into the immense propagandist enterprise. It played so large a part in preparing the way for the French Revolution. Diderot was the democrat who even went so far as to say that with regard to moral education the child of the poor is better off than the child of the rich. The people were struck by what united the *philosophes*, not by what separated them. The Encyclopedia furnished the evidence of the harmony of the *philosophes* in the eighteenth century, at least on certain cardinal points, and this harmony was the causes of the power of la philosophic at that period.⁸⁴ In what has been called the Credo of the Encyclopaedists there were many articles that the people could not understand and which might not have interested them; but the protests it carried were inspired by the sight of the crushing misery of the poor did not fail to touch it ; later on it could easily understand the generosity of feeling which prompted those thinkers who preferred to rank as 'citizens'. The "man of letters" in the eighteenth century was the *philosophe*. He appeared to the people as a thinker, guided, in d'Alembert's phrase, by 'public spirit' and had the 'wish to see men happy.' The writings of the *philosophes* were remarkably well calculated to create for them a public following. The encyclopaedists being aware of the French people's literacy level preferred clearness to depth and popularity to subtlety but they influenced the people precisely because they could be understood by the artisans who knew how to read, and still more because they could be expounded to the illiterate.⁸⁵

Diderot, in his article on 'Privilege' protested against their abuse. A distinction he told should be made in every case between persons who have rendered real services to the State and the large number of useless persons enjoying privileges undeservedly whose only claim is a title vouched for by a bit of parchment bought cheap. This all points clearly to the exemption of the poorest classes from taxation. Diderot, in his *Politique des Souverains* writes: "When need is satisfied, the rest belongs to the Treasury."⁸⁶ He exposed the injustice of the privileged order of the day in a way poverty would be recognized and consequently the debt of the rich; inequality of incidence would be

prevented. He argued against unjust tax burdens which were crushing the poor: 'Taxes should only be levied on those who are above the level of real need. All below that level belong to the class of the poor and this class should pay nothing.'

That is also the meaning of Raynal's definition: "Taxation may be defined as the sacrifice of a portion of property for the protection of the other portion," and Raynal attacks the food taxes levied on essential articles of food, because they affect absolute necessities, to which society has no right. Jaucourt demands, in the *Encyclopedic*: "labour should be exempt from taxation. It is bad policy to tax the workman's industry, for it forces him to pay to the state precisely because he creates for the State values that would not exist without him; it is the way to destroy industry, ruin the state and cut off its supplies... Damilaville declared: "When the entire nation's wealth is concentrated in a few hands, the masses must be in want, and crushed by the burden of taxation. In what proportion does the slight contribution made from enormous superfluity stand to the necessities of which the poor are robbed? The *philosophers* believed in graduation of taxation."⁸⁷

Taxes must be adjusted according to the wealth and privileges a man enjoys; for taxes must not be levied on necessities. As long as the taxes are not levied according to capacity to pay, the condition of this kingdom cannot improve; one part of the nation will live in opulence, eating at one meal what would feed a hundred families, whilst the other part is daily starving to death. Their popularity was increased by their demand that the burden of the poor should be alleviated by forcing the clergy to bear its share of public charges.⁸⁸ The Encyclopaedists had brought, the philanthropic spirit into philosophy and literature, and now brought it into philanthropy. In place of the almsgiving, that humiliated, the recipient, they demanded help, paid regularly as a right. Babeau says that the eighteenth century has been called the century of benevolence, when charity, inspired by the love of God, was reinforced by philanthropy inspired by the love of humanity. The great movement, which gave the human spirit a fresh orientation by opening out to it horizons less distant than those of another life, made itself felt in public and private relief works as

in other things; the movement that had begun in the sixteenth century, when the secular administration of buildings for public relief was transferred from clerical to lay hands, continued and culminated under the influence of the *philosophes*. The Abb de Saint-Pierre declared good works to be a social duty, independent of religion. Moncrif said they should be considered as an investment, which always gives a return a simple inference from the philosophes' maxim that the welfare of the individual was always bound up with the general welfare. The Encyclopaedists wished to see religious morality superseded by this social morality. "The degree of moral virtue is measured by the sacrifice made for the community", said Duclos. Hence the duty of philanthropy. Duclos was one of those who noted the fierceness of the fight for existence and the triumph of the doctrine of success. To consider life as a game at chess that You must win even by cheating, such is the right attitude for the conqueror ; to admit that one has lost by one's own fault, to blame oneself and not the winner, such is the right attitude for the vanquished. The struggle for life is the cause of and excuse for the loss of those moral virtues which tend to the good of man and society. But the sight of this egoism does not lessen the writer's faith in the identity of interest of the individual and society. He considers this a self-evident truth which it is dangerous to submit to debate. The philosophers asserted finely, although perhaps rashly, that man must work for the happiness of others in order to be happy himself and that philanthropy was the highest self-interest. Hence, the introduction of the secular spirit into the work of relief. Writers distinguished benevolence from charity.⁸⁹ Duclos declared that "of all empires that of the intellectuals, though invisible, is the widest spread. Those in power command, but the intellectuals govern, because in the end they form public opinion, which sooner or later subdues or upsets all despotisms. La Bruyere would not have written that but Diderot's opinion did not differ much from those of Voltaire when he told the progress of civilization was connected with that of knowledge. "A university", he wrote, "is a school whose door is open without distinction to all the children of the nation, and where masters, paid by the state, impart an elementary knowledge of all the sciences. Without

distinction, because it would be as cruel as it would be foolish to condemn the lower ranks of society to ignorance.⁹⁰

Criticism of the Church

La Mettrie (1709-51), an army physician wrote a book *Natural History of the Soul* which earned him exile in Germany. He took refuge at the court of Frederick. He blasted the dogma of the Church in this book. He inquires into reason for man's intelligence holding that why animals have intelligence compared with plants are because they have to move to satisfy their wants. Man is the most intelligent of all species as he has 'the greatest wants and widest mobility.'⁹¹

Claude-Arien Helvetius (1715-71) in his book *On Man* attacked the belief that conscience was given by the grace of God. He said that conscience was not the voice of God, but the fear of the police. It is the deposit left in us from the stream of prohibitions poured over the growing soul by parents and teachers and press. Morality must be founded on sociology rather than theology. The source of all action is egoism and pleasure. Diderot questioned the foundations of beliefs: "Belief in God is bound up with submissions to autocracy; the two rise and fall together and man will never be free till the last king is strangled with entrails of the last priest."

Baron d'Holbach (1723-89) too contributed to weakening reverence for the Church in his book *System of Nature* by holding that fear and ignorance were the roots of the belief in the existence of God and the Church used deceit, fancy and sentiments to strengthen these roots. He subjected the Bible to devastating criticism by showing that it contained concepts which we today regard as barbarous, and that it sanctioned tyranny. 'We find in all the religions of the earth,' says Holbach, 'a God of armies', a 'jealous God', an 'avenging God', a 'destroying God', a 'God' who is pleased with carnage and whom his worshippers consider it as a duty to serve to this taste ... Man ... believes himself forced to bend under the yoke of his god, known to him only by the fabulous accounts given by

his ministers, who, after binding each unhappy mortal in the chains of prejudice, remain his masters or else abandon him defenseless to the absolute power of tyrants, no less terrible than the gods, of whom they are the representatives upon earth ⁹³

Durant says that *Encyclopedie* had been New Testament of the Age of Reason. ⁹⁴ Marquis de Condorcet (1743-94) was an encyclopedist who also participated in the events of the French Revolution. He was elected to the Legislative Assembly that ruled France from October 1, 1791 to September 20, 1792. As Chairman on Public Instruction he drew up a report advocating and outlining a national system of primary and secondary education, universal, free, equal for both sexes, and removed from the ecclesiastical influence. He laid down the principle of the “welfare state” when Napoleon had established his power he made Condorcet’s report the basis of his epochal reorganization of education in France.

He also advocated the universal suffrage including women to prevent the reestablishment of ancient regime. The National Convention after his death secured and read his book *Prospectus* that he wrote while in hiding for fear of death at the hands of his revolutionary colleagues. Convention ordered three thousand copies of his book of it to be printed by the state and to be disseminated throughout France. This book was both a summary of the Enlightenment and was a blueprint of the coming utopia. ⁹⁵

CONCLUSION

When a *thought* intervenes in human affairs, it does not necessarily ensure its replica in real human situation, for those who work for its implementation have their own version of the thought and their own perceptions of the human reality in which they find themselves. It results in the complex situation in which numerous possibilities of the thought in question unfold. This is what we see in the Reign of Terror when ‘Robespierre, Saint Just and their party’ inspired with Rousseauian conception of the republic and equality sought to ward off the threats which came their way by means of violence. The execution of Louis XVI was probably necessary for the safety of the Republic at the time when the Reign of Terror had begun, if the idea of the Republic was to triumph over the absolutist despotism, especially when the Revolution was facing imminent foreign invasion combined with domestic treachery. As before, the moment decisive action was taken, matters began to mend on all sides, though Toulon was in the hands of the English, Marseilles and Boulogne were taken from the Girondin immigrants and Lyons besieged. The Committee of Public Safety set up by the Convention acted as the cutting edge of the war against internal reaction, while the "levee en masse" provided the mass forces needed to smash external intervention. The excesses were committed, as is the case in every war, particularly in a civil war. It can not be said with certitude that the revolution could have survived without it in this hour of mortal peril.

Thomson in his book *Europe Since Napoleon* presents a familiar argument against influence of philosophical ideas on the Revolution: “The doctrine of *philosophes* came to be used later on, during the course of revolution in France, often to justify measures that the philosophers themselves would have opposed.: if they had any influence at all on the outbreak and the initial stages of the great revolution, it was only to the extent that that they had fostered critical and irreverent attitude toward all existing institutions.”⁹⁶ “If the Revolution became source of democratic revolutions that quality was derived from subsequent events, and was not present in either the intentions or the actions of the original revolutionaries.”⁹⁷ The English critic of the French Revolution, Edmund Burke, tried to discredit the Revolution in 1790 by writing his *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. In it he dammed the revolution and its entire works. He attacked the whole notion of social change and reserved his worst venom for the 'swinish multitude'. Thomas Paine, his countryman, rose to defend the revolution in his *The Rights of Man* in reply to Burke’s critique of revolution. Paine’s work proved to be enormously influential in the English radical and embryonic working class movements. The reactionary English bourgeoisie made life hard for Paine and he had to flee to France to avoid arrest.

The questions which some historians are prone to ask: How could deep and difficult ideas of philosophers influence the actions of the revolutionaries when a mass of the French people was illiterate? Roustan in his work *The Pioneers of the French Revolution*, gives answer to this question by drawing the analogy between the socialist revolutions of the workers haunting the 20th century Europe and 18th century France : “If in our days there are workmen who are totally illiterate and who do not even attend public meetings, and if they declare themselves supporters of a Socialism they do not understand, which of us will dare to assert that Socialist writers and speakers have not had the deepest influence on them?

Of course these poor fellows have not read Proudhon or Karl Marx, but they have to bear a burden which they find crushing, and they feel that it depends on their own efforts to alleviate it. They discovered the first point for themselves unaided; the second idea has come to them unconsciously from those whom they never heard speak, and whose

writings they have never read. I should say the same of the people in the eighteenth century. Even if three-fourths of those poor wretches were incapable of reading any of the writings which emanated from the *philosophes*, and with which the capital was swarming, even if they knew nothing of the contents of those writings

Through their better-equipped comrades, even if they had never set foot inside a theatre, they all lived in an atmosphere impregnated with the ideas of the reformers, and they breathed it in, in spite of themselves.... As a matter of fact there was a growing reading public getting poorer in quality of life but richer in quantity; and it was this public which in one form or another adapted the doctrines of the Encyclopaedists to the beliefs of future society and popularized them to suit "lowest classes," who were thus enabled to get their share that it may be necessary to go back to the past long before the *philosophes* to explain the Revolution." But it can not be claimed it would have been carried out without them, especially in the way it was carried out.⁹⁸

Durant is of the view that 'we can not doubt that philosophers profoundly affected the ideology and the political drama of the Revolution, though they had not intended to produce violence, massacre, and guillotine and in that they were cruelly misunderstood.'⁹⁹

Hegel has established the relationship between ideas and condition and how this relationship helped to bring about the radical change in the society. "The philosophers called on the government to sweep away the abuses and appoint honourable men as ministers. The French Revolution was forced on by the stiff-necked obstinacy of prejudices, by haughtiness, utter want of thought and avarice. The philosophers gave only the general idea of what ought to be done. They did not indicate the mode of revolution to carry out the reforms they conceived."¹⁰⁰ He further describes the state of affairs existing in 1789 France: "French Philosophy was against the Catholic religion, the fetters of superstition and of the hierarchy. The French philosophy also attacked the state; it assailed prejudices and superstitions, especially the depravity of civic life, of court manners and of Government officials; it laid hold of and brought to light the evil, the ridiculous, the base, and exposed the whole tissue of hypocrisy and unjust power to the derision, the contempt and the hatred of the world at large, and thus brought men's minds

and hearts into a state of indifference to idols of the world and indignations against them.¹⁰¹ “The French Enlightenment placed the positive source of knowledge and of justice in human reason and the common consciousness of mankind.”¹⁰² Hegel explains why the violence became necessary as the events unfolded: “The entire political system appeared as one mass of injustice. The change was necessarily violent because the work of transformation was not undertaken by the government. And the reason why the government did not undertake was that Court, the clergy, the nobility, and the parliaments themselves were unwilling to surrender their privileges they possessed, either for the sake of expediency or that of abstract Right and the government also did not reconstruct state on the bases of rights of citizens.”¹⁰³ Even if the methods to implement the doctrines of the philosophers were not in harmony with the true spirit of ideas during the Revolution, as Roustau argues with great subtlety for the decisive role of the philosophers in the French Revolution, the effort which we are now making to base our political and social system along the lines of ‘Reason and Liberty’ will certainly have its source of inspiration in the ideas of the philosophers. “Ideas can never lead beyond an old world order”, as Marx argues, “but only beyond the ideas of the old world order.” Ideas change the men who are dissatisfied with the order in which they find themselves and the order which they seek to leave behind themselves. In order to carry out ideas, men are needed who can exert practical force. The French Revolution, being itself inspired with ideas gave birth to ideas which led beyond the ideas of the entire old word order.¹⁰⁴

NOTES:

1. Simon Schama, *Citizens: A Chronicle of the French Revolution* (New York: Knopf, 1989), 3.
2. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*.trans. Saul K. Padover (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1937), 11.
3. Vladimir Ilych Lenin, *What is to be Done?*” (London: Oxford University Press, 1963), 75.
4. Ibid., 78.
5. Kingsley Martin, review of *The Pioneers of the French Revolution*, by M Roustau, *Economica* 18 (November 1926): 345.
6. Will Durant and Ariel Durant, *The Story of Civilization*. vol. 10: *Rousseau and Revolution* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1967), 897.
7. G.W.F. Hegel, *The Philosophy of History*, trans. J.Sibree (New York: Dover Publications, Inc.,1956), 446.
8. Ibid., 452.
9. F.Furet, *Interpreting the French Revolution*, trans. E Forster (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 8.
10. Frederick Engels, *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, (Sydney: Resistance Books, 1999) , 61.

11. E. N. Williams *The Penguin Dictionary of English and European History (1485-1789)* (Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1982), 132-133.
12. M. Rouston, *The Pioneers of the French Revolution*, trans. Fredric Whyte (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1926), 23.
13. Williams, 133.
14. Hippolyte. A. Taine : *The Origins of Contemporary France, Vol 1: The Ancient Regime*, trans. Jonh Durand (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1966), 33.
15. F. Furet and Denis Richet, *The French Revolution 1770–1814* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 25.
16. G. W. F. Hegel, *Lectures on The History of Philosophy*, trans. E.S Haldane and Frances. H. Simson Vol 1 (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, 1955), 389.
17. Howard Selsam and Harry Martel, eds., ***Reader in Marxist Philosophy From the Writings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin*** (New York: International Publishers, 1973), 27.
18. M.Rouston, 22.
19. Ibid., 18.
20. Will Durant, *The Pleasures of Philosophy* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1953), 288.
21. Frederick Engels, *Anti-Duhring* (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1947), 383
22. Will Durant and Ariel Durant, *Lessons of History* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1968), 53.
23. David Thomson, *Europe Since Napoleon* (Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1982), 24.
24. Alfred Cobban; *A History of Modern France*, vol. 1: 1715-1799 (New York: George Braziller, 1965), 150.
25. Baron de Montesquieu, *The Spirit of Laws*, trans. Thomas Nugent (Paris: Bayet & Albert, 1926), 35.
26. Ibid., 54.
27. Ibid., 21
28. Cobban, 166.
29. Montesquieu, 40.
30. Schama, 289.

31. Nesta Webster, *The French Revolution* (New York: Noontide Press, 1989), 186.
32. Schama, 121.
33. Durant, *The Story of Civilization*, 890.
34. Jean Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract*, trans. Maurice Cranston (Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1982), 49.
35. George Jellinek, *The Declaration of the Rights of Man And of Citizens: A Contribution To Modern Constitutional History*, trans. Max Farrand (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1901), 4.
36. Edmund Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1982), 201.
37. Durant, *The Story of Civilization*, 881.
38. Ibid., 891
39. Rousseau, 119.
40. Ibid., 61-62.
41. Ibid., 119.
42. Ibid., 53.
43. G.W.F.Hegel, *Philosophy of Right*, trans. S.W Dyde (Ontario: Batoche Books Ltd., 2001), 55.
44. Robert Walker, "Contextualizing Hegel's Phenomenology of the French Revolution and Terror," *Political Theory* 26, no. 1 (1998) : 33-55.
45. Ibid., 39.
46. Z. A. Pelczynski, *Political Community and Individual Freedom in Hegel's Philosophy of State* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 33.
47. Jean Jacques Rousseau, *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*, trans. Franklin Philip (London: Oxford University Press, 1994),
48. Hegel, *Philosophy of Right*, 46.
49. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The Holy Family: The Critique of Critical Criticism* (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1980), 147.
50. Durant, *The Story of Civilization*, 891.

51. Ibid., 880
52. Ibid., 899.
53. Thomson, 40.
54. Durant, *The Story of Civilization*, 880.
55. Will Durant, *The Story of Philosophy* (New York: Washington Square Press, 1961), 244.
56. Durant, *The Story of Civilization*, 880.
57. Francois Marie Arouet Voltaire, *Philosophical Dictionary*, trans. Theodor Besterman (Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1979), 161.
58. Ibid., 346
59. Ibid., 161
60. John Mackinnon Robertson, *History of Free thought in the Nineteenth Century*, part 1 (New York: Kessinger Publishers, 2003), 146.
61. Durant, *The Story of Philosophy*, 236.
62. Voltaire, 115.
63. Ibid., 322.
64. Durant, *The Story of Philosophy*, 247.
65. Durant, *The Story of Civilization*, 880.
66. Ibid., 881
67. Voltaire, 387.
68. Ibid., 390.
69. Francois Marie Arouet Voltaire, *Treatise on Tolerance*, trans. Brian Masters (London: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 6.
70. Ibid., 145.
71. Ibid., 123.
72. Joseph McCabe, trans. *Toleration and Other Essays by Voltaire*, ((New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1912), 29.
73. Ibid., 30.
74. Voltaire, *Philosophical Dictionary*, 182.
75. Ibid., 183.

76. Durant, *The Story of Philosophy*, 245.
77. Ibid., 245.
78. Ibid., 247.
79. Rouston., 293
80. Durant, *The Story of Philosophy*, 252.
81. Rouston, 294.
82. R. M. Johnston,, *The French Revolution: A Short History* (New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1910), 15.
83. Ibid., 27.
84. Rouston, 257.
85. Ibid., 263.
86. Ibid., 270.
87. Ibid., 271.
88. Ibid., 272.
89. Ibid., 277.
90. Ibid., 256.
91. Durant, *The Story of Philosophy*, 231.
92. Ibid., 231.
93. Baron D'Holbach, *Good Sense: or Natural Ideas as Opposed to Supernatural*, (New York: G. Vale, 1856), pp.viii-ix..
94. Durant, *The Story of Civilization*, 888.\
95. Ibid., 895.
96. Thomson, 24.
97. Ibid., 32.
98. Rouston., 284.
99. Durant, *The Story of Civilization*, 899.\
100. Hegel, *The History of Philosophy*, 390.
101. Ibid., 388.
102. Ibid., 392.

103. Hegel, *The Philosophy of History*, 446-47.
104. Marx, *The Holy Family*, 148.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Burke, Edmund. *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1982.
- Cobban, Alfred. *A History of Modern France*, vol. 1: 1715-1799. New York: George Braziller, 1965.
- D'Holbach, Baron. *Good Sense: or Natural Ideas as Opposed to Supernatural*. New York: G. Vale, 1856.
- Durant, Will. *The Story of Philosophy*. New York: Washington Square Press, 1961.
- . *The Pleasures of Philosophy* . New York: Simon & Schuster, 1953.
- Durant, Will and Ariel Durant. *Lessons of History*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1968.
- . *The Story of Civilization*. Vol. 10: *Rousseau and Revolution*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1967.
- Engels, Frederick. *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, Sydney: Resistance Books, 1999.
- . *Anti-Duhring*. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1947.
- Furet, F. *Interpreting the French Revolution*. Translated by E Forster. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- F. Furet and Denis Richet. *The French Revolution 1770–1814*. London: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Hegel, G.W.F. *The Philosophy of History*, Translated by J.Sibree New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1956.

------. Lectures on The History of Philosophy. Translated by E.S Haldane and Frances. H. Simson Vol 1. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, 1955.

------. *Philosophy of Right*. Translated by S .W Dyde. Ontario: Batoche Books Ltd., 2001.

Jellinek, George. *The Declaration of the Rights of Man And of Citizens: A Contribution To Modern Constitutional History*. Translated by Max Farrand. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1901.

Johnston, R. M. *The French Revolution: A Short History*. New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1910.

Lenin Vladimir,Ilych. *What is to be Done?"* London: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. *18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*. Translated by Saul K. Padover. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1937.

------. *The Holy Family: The Critique of Critical Criticism*. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1980.

Martin, Kingsley. Review of *The Pioneers of the French Revolution*, by M Roustan, *Economica* 18 (November 1926): 345-347

McCabe, Joseph McCabe. Trans. *Toleration and Other Essays by Voltaire*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1912.

Montesquieu, Baron de. *The Spirit of Laws*. Translated by Thomas Nugent. Paris: Bayet & Albert, 1926.

Pelczynski,Z, A. *Political Community and Individual Freedom in Hegel's Philosophy of State*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Robertson, Johan Mackinnon. *History of Free thought in the Nineteenth Century*. Part 1. New York: Kessinger Publishers, 2003.

Roustan, M. *The Pioneers of the French Revolution*. Ttranslated by Fredric Whyte. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1926.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques. *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*. Translated by Franklin Philip. London: Oxford University Press, 1994.

-----, *The Social Contract*. Translated by Maurice Cranston. Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1982.

Schama, Simon. *Citizens: A Chronicle of the French Revolution*. New York: Knopf, 1989.

Selsam, Howard and Harry Martel. eds. *Reader in Marxist Philosophy From the Writings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin*. New York: International Publishers, 1973.

Taine, Hippolyte. A. *The Origins of Contemporary France. Vol 1: The Ancient Regime*. Translated by Jonh Durand. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1966.

Thomson, David. *Europe Since Napoleon*. Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1982.

Votaire, Francois Marie Arouet. *Philosophical Dictionary*. Translated by Theodor Besterman. Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1979.

-----, *Treatise on Tolerance*. Translated by Brian Masters. London: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Walker, Robert. "Contextualizing Hegel's Phenomenology of the French Revolution and Terror." *Political Theory* 26, no. 1 (1998) : 33-55.

Webster, Nesta. *The French Revolution*. New York: Noontide Press, 1989.

William, E. N. *The Penguin Dictionary of English and European History (1485-1789)*. Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1982.